

width modulator regulator shown in the referenced U.S. Patent 4,386,310 to Sievers.

The production of the high frequency signal 41 at the terminal B is described in the specification at the bottom of page 10 and the top of page 11. The specification clearly recites that this high frequency signal can be produced by the regulator 11 either by utilizing an internal very high frequency reference oscillator that was used to generate the pulse width modulated output at the terminal 20 or by using a separate high frequency reference oscillator which is independent of the other circuitry in the voltage regulator 11. Clearly this is an adequate enabling description of how a voltage regulator 11, such as the referenced Sievers regulator, can be used to produce the high frequency output signal at the terminal B. All that the specification says is that either the high frequency signal is produced by an oscillator that is used by the circuitry in the regulator 11 which produces the pulse width modulated signal or it is produced by separate oscillator circuitry in the voltage regulator 11. Thus, while the Examiner's objection to the use of term "conventional", as applied to the entire voltage regulator 11 shown in Figure 1, may be appropriate, certainly there can be no question with regard to the sufficiency of the original description of the present invention with regard to providing a voltage regulator which performs all of the necessary circuit functions required of the voltage regulator 11.

The claims 1 through 17 were rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, because of the above noted 35 USC 112 specification defect. Since the specification has been corrected by the present Amendment, this rejection of the claims is thought to be overcome. The claims 1 through 17 were also rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite due to the use of the preposition "between". In

the present Amendment, this preposition has been corrected in both the claims and specification by replacing it with the more appropriate preposition "across" when referring to the connection of circuit elements across a specified voltage potential.

In the claims, new claim 18 has been added. This claim corresponds to old claim 5, but directly depends on claim 1.

The above-recited modifications to the specification and claims are believed to render the present application in condition for allowance since no prior art or other objections were raised by the Examiner. Thus, allowance of the present application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

ARTHUR JAMES EDWARDS and
MIHALY LAMOTH

By: Phillip H. Melamed
Phillip H. Melamed
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 27,716
Phone: (312) 576-5218

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, DC 20231, on this date:

July 9, 1987
Date

Mary M. Wright